

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed February 22, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 16-22, and 24 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 17, 20, and 24. Claims 28-31 have been added. As a result, claims 1,2,7,8,11,16-22, 24, and 28-31 are pending for examination with claims 1, 7, 17, and 20 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 24 is objected to because claim 24 is listed as depending on a cancelled claim 23. Applicant has amended claim 24 to depend from independent claim 20.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 7, 16-18, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0006902) in view of Launay (U.S. Patent No. 6,111,303) and in further view of Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,276). Claims 2, 8, 19, 22, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Launay and Thompson and in further view of Rydbeck (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,322). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Launay and Thompson, and in further view of Ausems et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,403).

In the Examiner's rejection of each of independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 20, the Examiner admits that Ito and Launay do not specifically disclose a removable battery, the antenna being fixed to the removable battery. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner relies on Thompson, contending that Thompson provides a removable battery whereto the antenna is fixed. As a result, the Examiner further contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Ito and Launay by combining it with Thompson, thereby providing a removable battery where the antenna is fixed to the removable battery. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully points out that Thompson does not provide an antenna being fixed to a removable battery. Rather, the antenna is fixed to an application module (see reference number 100 on FIG. 10 of Thompson), the application module being insertable into a cell phone for enhancing functionality of the device by incorporating a number of independent electrical components together. As noted in column 15, lines 29-34 of Thompson, the application module has an electrical circuit that includes a power supply located thereon, instead of the power supply being located on the cell phone. In this respect, the antenna of Thompson is not fixed *directly* to a removable battery of the cell phone. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 20 to further clarify this distinction. Specifically, the claims have been amended to recite the antenna being *fixed directly* to the removable battery.

Furthermore, Applicant notes that the power supply located on the application module of Thompson is used to augment or assist another already existing power supply associated with the device (see column 15, lines 48-60). In particular, the power supply that the Examiner refers to in Thompson does not provide primary electrical power to the cell phone. Applicant has additionally amended independent claims to recite a removable battery for *providing primary electrical power to the cell phone*. As a result of these amendments, independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 20 should be in condition for allowance. Because claim 2 depends directly from independent claim 1; claims 8, 11, and 16 depend directly from independent claim 7; claims 18-19 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 17; and claims 21-22 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 20, these claims should also be allowed.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: May 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Neil P. Ferraro, Reg. No. 39, 188
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
Telephone: (617) 646-8000